

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 09/785,390	Applicant(s) BOURNE ET AL.	
	Examiner Mark Eashoo, Ph.D.	Art Unit 1732	

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) Mark Eashoo, Ph.D.

(3) _____

(2) Pamela J. Curbelo.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: _____

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

that of record

Claims discussed:

those pending

Prior art documents discussed:

that cited

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Exr. Eashoo called Ms. Curbelo regarding a proposed Exr. Amdt. to claim 29 adding the limitation directed to the retardation value recited in claim 11 (preamble). The amendment was needed because applicant's arguments directed to the process forming a structure with specific retardation properties, filed 29-DEC-2003, are persuasive. However, without the proposed amendment the arguments would not apply to claim 29. Ms. Curbelo approved the amendment.